



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/727,329	12/04/2003	Mitsuhiro Kasahara	123576	5953	
7055	7590 04/05/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.			CHANG, KENT WU		
RESTON, VA	D CLARKE PLACE A 20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2629	2629	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Appl	ication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/7	27,329	KASAHARA ET	AL.			
		Exar	miner	Art Unit				
			Chang	2629				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears o	on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence a	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAINS IN THE M	ILING DATE O 37 CFR 1.136(a). In lication. tory period will apply II, by statute, cause to	OF THIS COMMUNIC on no event, however, may a re and will expire SIX (6) MONT the application to become ABA	CATION.  ply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status								
1)  ズ	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <i>12/8/04</i>						
·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	)∐ This action	n is non-final					
′=		•		ers, prosecution as to th	ne merits is			
-,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
· ·	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or elect	ion requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	Fxaminer						
·			or b) objected to b	y the Examiner				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
				• •	CER 1 121(d)			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority do	ocuments have	been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority do			oplication No.				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of				ıl Stage			
	application from the International							
* 8	ee the attached detailed Office action			eceived.				
Attachmen	c(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			ummary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC			/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PT	TO 452)			
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT r No(s)/Mail Date	(O/SB/U8)	6) Other:		(U-132)			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Art Unit: 2629

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The requirement for return of the original letters patent is vacated in view of applicant's argument.

## **Double Patenting**

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/727,331. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that estimating a temperature estimation value is the same as providing a temperature estimation value based on the video signal.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 2629

4. Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/727,326. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the display could have included a plurality of regions since any display device could be divided into a plurality of regions.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/727,330. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the displayed image could have been a gray scale image so as to provide additional information and better image quality to the viewer.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

# Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/8/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument recited in the second paragraph on page 3, note that the rejection is not based on the specification, therefore, the feature showed in

page 56 of Applicant's specification, but was not included in the claims (such as claim 14 of the current Application) would not be considered as the claimed invention.

Applicant should note that the claimed subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention.

The remainder of the pertinent topics for argument are present in the appropriate rejections above.

## Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

## **CONTACT INFORMATION**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-7667. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2629

2620

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz, can be reached at 571-272-3638.

# Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

#### or faxed to:

## 571-273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kent Chang Primary Examiner Division 2629

~ \*

kc 4/1/06